



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,160	02/28/2002	Shuji Kaneko	220125US0 X	4862
22850	7590	01/29/2004		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER JONES, DWAYNE C	
			ART UNIT 1614	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/084,160

Applicant(s)

KANEKO ET AL.

Examiner

Dwayne C Jones

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,9-14 and 21-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1,2 and 9-14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 21-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 9-14 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9/4/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Claims 1, 2, 9-14, 21-36 are pending.
2. Claims 1, 2, and 9-14 are non-elected and withdrawn from consideration, see Office Action of July 28, 2003.
3. Claims 3-8 and 15-20 are cancelled as per the amendment of November 26, 2003.
4. Claims 21-36 are elected and rejected.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 21-36 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement of related applications of September 4, 2003 has been reviewed and considered, see enclosed copy of this form.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1614

8. Claims 21-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for potentiating an N-type Ca^{2+} channel activity, does not reasonably provide enablement for the treatment of a brain disorder let alone the prevention of a brain disorder. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in In re Wands, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

(1) The nature of the invention:

The instant invention is directed to treating brain disorders as well as preventing brain disorders. The method comprises administering the piperazinyl compounds of formula (I).

(2) The state of the prior art

Art Unit: 1614

The compounds of the inventions are piperazinyl compounds of formula (I). However, the prior art does not teach that these piperazinyl compounds possess the biochemical property of potentiating an N-type Ca^{2+} channel activity possess these types of properties, see Wang et al. of the Office Action dated July 28, 2003.

(3) The relative skill of those in the art

The relative skill of those in the art of pharmaceuticals is high.

(4) The predictability or unpredictability of the art

The unpredictability of the pharmaceutical art is very high. In fact, the courts have made a distinction between mechanical elements function the same in different circumstances, yielding predictable results, chemical and biological compounds often react unpredictably under different circumstances. Nationwide Chem. Corp. v. Wright, 458 F. Supp. 828, 839, 192 USPQ 95, 105(M.D. Fla. 1976); Aff'd 584 F.2d 714, 200 USPQ 257 (5th Cir. 1978); In re Fischer, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 10, 24 (CCPA 1970). Thus, the physiological activity of a chemical or biological compound is considered to be an unpredictable art. For example, in Ex Parte Sudilovsky, the Court held that Appellant's invention directed to a method for preventing or treating a disease known as tardive dyskinesia using an angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor involved unpredictable art because it concerned the pharmaceutical activity of the compound. 21 USPQ2d 1702, 1704-5 (BDAI 1991); In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 1557, 1562, 29 USPQ, 22 (holding that the physiological activity of compositions of adrenocorticotrophic hormones

Art Unit: 1614

was unpredictable art); In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 29 USPQ d, 1570, 1513-14 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (holding that the physiological activity of RNA viruses was unpredictable art); Ex Parte Hitzeman, 9 USPQ2d 1821, 1823 (BDAI 1987); Ex Parte Singh, 17 USPQ2d 1714, 1715, 1716 (BPAI 1990). Likewise, the physiological or pharmaceutical activity of the piperazinyl compounds of formula (I) for treating, as well as preventing, a disorder of the brain prior to filing of the instant invention was an unpredictable art.

(5) The breadth of the claims

The instant claims are very broad. For instance, claims 21 and 36 are directed to the treatment as well as the prevention of a plethora brain disorders with the piperazinyl compounds of formula (I). The breadth of claims was a factor in Amgen v. Chugai Pharm. Co., 927 F.2d 1200, 18 USPQ2d (Fed. Cir.), cert. Denied, 502 U.S. 856 (1991). In the Amgen case, the patent claims were directed to DNA sequences that encoded amino acid sequences. Because a very small change in the amino acid sequence of a protein can result in a very large change in the structure-function activity of a protein and because the laws of protein folding are in such a primitive state, predicting protein structure (and hence, activity) while knowing only the sequence of the protein is akin to predicting the weather for a date in the future.

(6) The amount of direction or guidance presented

The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to the degree of predictability in the art. In re Fisher, 839, 166 USPQ 24. Thus, although a single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements, in cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, more teaching or guidance is required. In re Fischer, 427 F.2d 839, 166 USPQ 24; Ex Parte Hitzeman, 9 USPQ 2d 1823. For example, the Federal Circuit determined that, given the unpredictability of the physiological activity of RNA viruses, a specification requires more than a general description and a single embodiment to provide an enabling disclosure for a method of protecting an organism against RNA viruses. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1562-63, 27 USPQ2d 1575. In the instant case, given the unpredictability of the physiological or pharmaceutical activity of a piperazinyl compounds to be effective in treating a brain disorder, not to mention the prevention of a brain disorder, is insufficient for enablement. The instant specification provides no guidance, in the way of enablement for piperazinyl compounds of formula (I) for the treatment and prevention of brain disorders. In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) (contrasting mechanical and electrical elements with chemical reactions and physiological activity). See also In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 27 USPQ2d 1510 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). This is because it is not obvious from the disclosure of one species, what other species will work. In re Dreshfield, 110 F.2d 235, 45 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1940), gives this general rule: "It is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it

Art Unit: 1614

must appear in an applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient number of the members of a group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals or chemical combinations included in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired result." The article "Broader than the Disclosure in Chemical Cases," 31 J.P.O.S. 5, by Samuel S. Levin covers this subject in detail. A disclosure should contain representative examples, which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds fall within the scope of a claim will possess the alleged activity. See In re Riat et al. (CCPA 1964) 327 F2d 685, 140 USPQ 471; In re Barr et al. (CCPA 1971) 444 F 2d 349, 151 USPQ 724.

(7) The presence or absence of working examples

As stated above, the specification alleges that the piperazinyl compounds of formula (I) have the ability to treat and even prevent brain disorders. However, the instant specification does not have enablement with actual working examples for these compounds to be effective in the alleged utility of treating and preventing brain disorders.

(8) The quantity of experimentation necessary

The quantity of experimentation needed to be performed by one skilled in the art is yet another factor involved in the determining whether "undue experimentation" is required to make and use the instant invention. "The test is not merely quantitative, since a considerable amount of experimentation is permissible, if it is merely routine, or

Art Unit: 1614

if the specification in question provides a reasonable amount of guidance with respect to the direction in which the experimentation should proceed.” In re Wands, 858 F.2d 737, 8 USPQ2d 1404 (citing In re Angstadt, 537 F.2d 489, 502-04, 190 USPQ 214, 218 (CCPA 1976)). For these reasons, one of ordinary skill in the art would be burdened with undue "painstaking experimentation study" to determine how the instant compounds of formula (I) would be enabled in this specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

Art Unit: 1614

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

12. Claims 21-29 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. Wang et al. teach of the administration of the anti-dementia drug of FK 960. This compounds is shown to ameliorate the memory deficits in various experimental models of dementia. In addition, this compound is shown to have an effect of the voltage-activated Ca^{2+} channels, (see abstract). Although Wang et al. do not specifically recite the monohydrate salt of the instantly claimed compounds of FF906, the prior art reference of Wang et al. do teach of the very same compound that is claimed in this invention. It is well within the purview of the skilled artisan to select pharmaceutically acceptable salts, namely the monohydrate of a compound. In addition, it is also within the skill level of the artisan to determine optimum dosages as well as modes and methods of administration. It would have been obvious in view of Wang et al. for the skilled artisan to determine the pharmaceutically acceptable salt, such as the monohydrate of FK906, for the treatment against dementia.

13. Claims 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al. Claims 30-35 attempt to limit themselves from independent claim 21 by stating that the compound of formula (I) is obtained by a method of identifying the compound. These methods steps are just methods of identifying or assaying the compound of claim 21 that are allegedly used to treat brain disorders. For these

Art Unit: 1614

reasons, the compounds of method claims 30-35 are the very same compounds embraced by the compounds used in independent method claim 21. These claim are defined as a product-by-process claim and is a product, not a process, see In re Bridgeford, 357 F2d 679, 149, USPQ 5 (CCPA 1966). It is the patentability of the product claimed and not of the recited process steps which must be established, see In re Brown, 459 F2d 531, 173 USPQ 685 (CCPA 1972); In re Wertheim, 541 F2d, 191 USPQ (CCPA 1976). A comparison of the recited process with the prior art processes does not serve to resolve the issue concerning the patentability of the product, see In re Fessman, 489 F2d 742, 180 USPQ 324 (CCPA 1974). Wang et al. teach of Wang et al. teach of the administration of the anti-dementia drug of FK 960. This compounds is shown to ameliorate the memory deficits in various experimental models of dementia. In addition, this compound is shown to have an effect of the voltage-activated Ca^{2+} channels, (see abstract).

14. Although Wang et al. do not specifically recite the monohydrate salt of the instantly claimed compounds of FF906, the prior art reference of Wang et al. do teach of the very same compound that is claimed in this invention. It is well within the purview of the skilled artisan to select pharmaceutically acceptable salts, namely the monohydrate of a compound. In addition, it is also within the skill level of the artisan to determine optimum dosages as well as modes and methods of administration. It would have been obvious in view of Wang et al. for the skilled artisan to determine the pharmaceutically acceptable salt, such as the monohydrate of FK906, for the treatment against dementia.


Art Unit: 1614

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. C. Jones whose telephone number is (703) 308-4634 until about February 6, 2004 and then changes to (571) 272-0578. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Mondays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel can be reached on (703) 308-4725 until about February 6, 2004 and then changes to (571) 272-0584. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-

1235.


D. C. JONES
EXAMINER

Tech. Ctr. 1614
January 28, 2004